

**Remarks**

The final Office Action issued 11 June 2002 has been reviewed in light of the comments of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office included in the Advisory Action issued 23 September 2002. Applicant proposes to cancel claims 1-16 without prejudice or disclaimer, and to add new claims 17-29. As such, claims 17-29 would be pending in the application and are submitted for consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,869,744 to Suzuki et al. (Suzuki). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,668,873 to Ohba et al. (Ohba). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,161,087 to Frankeny et al. (Frankeny). Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,214,472 to Maxwell et al. (Maxwell). And claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,024,534 to Matsubara et al. (Matsubara). These rejections are respectfully submitted to be moot inasmuch as claims 1-16 have been cancelled.

New claim 17 recites a combination of features that includes interface 21 is a plug connector into housing 23 of which evaluating unit 211 is integrated.

In contrast, Suzuki fails to teach an analog-to-digital converter that is integrated into a plug connector housing, and fails to suggest integrating the analog-to-digital converter into the housing of the plug connector.

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Suzuki. Further, claims 18-29 depend from independent claim 17, and therefore also patentably distinguished over Suzuki for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited in the dependent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that entry of this Amendment is appropriate insofar as it places the application in condition for allowance. An early indication of allowance is earnestly solicited. Further, inasmuch as claims are exclusively being cancelled and added, it is respectfully submitted that it is not necessary to attached hereto an appendix identifying the changes to the claims made by this Amendment.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: 11 December 2002

By: Scott J. Anchell  
Scott J. Anchell  
Reg. No. 35,035

**Customer No. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: 202.739.3000  
Fax: 202.739.3001